

ON USE OF AN EXPLICIT CONGRUENCE PREDICATE IN BOUNDED ARITHMETIC

YORIYUKI YAMAGATA

ABSTRACT. We introduce system S_0^2E , a bounded arithmetic corresponding to Buss's S_0^2 with the predicate E which signifies the existence of the value. Then, we show that we can Σ_2^b -define truthness of S_0^2E and therefore we can prove consistency of S_0^2E in S_2^2 . Finally, we conjecture that $S_0^2E + \Sigma_1^b - PIND$ interprets S_1^2 .

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the central questions concerning Bounded Arithmetic is whether Buss's hierarchy $S_1^2 \subseteq S_2^2 \subseteq \dots$ of theories collapses [2]. Natural way to show difference between these theories is to look whether these theories proves (some appropriate formulation of) a consistency statement of some theory T . However, known results are mostly negative. Pudlák [3] shows S^2 cannot prove bounded consistency of S_1^2 . Buss and Ignjatović [1] improve Pudlák result showing that S_i^2 cannot prove B_i -bounded consistency of S_0^2 .

Here, natural question arises: is there a “sufficiently strong” theory which can be proved consistent inside S_i^2 for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$? By “sufficiently strong” theory we mean a theory T which can be used as a replacement of S_0^2 to formalize S_1^2 . In other word, we mean a theory T such that T plus $\Sigma_1^b - PIND$ can interpret S_1^2 .

To prove consistency of T inside S_i^2 , natural way is having a truth definition of the language of T inside S_i^2 . Looking Takeuti [4], main difficulty to have a truth definition of the language of S^2 inside S_i^2 is the fact that S_i^2 cannot uniformly prove the existence of valuation of the terms. This suggests that adding a predicate which signifies convergence of terms to S_i^2 makes consistency proof of S_i^2 easier.

In this paper, we define S_2^0E , a bounded arithmetic with an explicit congruence predicate and prove its soundness inside S_2^2 . S_2^0E does not have any induction axioms, hence it corresponds S_2^0 in Buss's hierarchy. In comparison to S_2^2 , it is very weak since for example, it does not contain commutativity of $+$, $\cdot$ and so on. However, we conjecture that if we add $S_2^0E + \Sigma_1^b - PIND$, it can interpret S_1^2 . This conjecture is supported by the fact that S_2^0E contains all inductive definition of functions and predicates. The language of S_2^0E is restricted to Σ_1^b -formulas so that S_2^2 can prove its soundness.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, The system S_2^0E is introduced. In Section 3, truth definition of S_2^0E inside S_2^2 is given. In Section 4, soundness and consistency of S_2^0E is proved inside S_2^2 . Finally, in Section 5 several conjecture concerning S_2^0E are given.

2. A BOUNDED ARITHMETIC S_2^0E USING EXPLICIT CONGRUENCE OPERATOR E

Definition 1 (Language of S_2^0E). *Language of S_2^0E consists of the following symbols.*

- constant 0
- Variables $x_1, x_2, \dots$ (denoted x, y, a, b , etc.)
- unary function symbols $S, \lfloor \frac{\cdot}{2} \rfloor, | \cdot |, s_0, s_1$ and binary function symbol $+, \times, \#$
- unary predicate symbols E and binary predicate (relation) symbol $\leq, =$
- logical symbols $\vee, \wedge, \neg$ and quantifiers $\forall, \exists$.

Definition 2 (Terms of S_2^0E). *Terms of S_2^0E are defined as recursively as follows.*

- Variables $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots$ are terms. We use metavariable x, y, z to denote variables.
- Constant 0 is term.
- If t_1, t_2 are terms, $St_1, t_1 + t_2, t_1 \times t_2, \lfloor \frac{t_1}{2} \rfloor, |t_1|, t_1 \# t_2, s_0 t_1, s_1 t_1$ are terms.

We use $t_1, t_2, \dots, t, s, u$ to denote terms. We say a term t sharply bounded if t has a form $|t'|$. For any natural number, there is a standard notation using shortest combination of $0, s_0, s_1$. If we use numerals $1, 2, 3, \dots$ in the language of S_2^0E , we understand that they are represented by such a standard notation.

Definition 3. *Formulas of S_2^0E are defined as follows.*

- For terms $t_1, \dots, t_n$ and n -ary predicate symbol p , $pt_1 \dots t_n$ and $\neg pt_1 \dots t_n$ are formulas. We often use $t \neq u$ and $t \not\leq u$ to denote $\neg t = u$ and $\neg t \leq u$ respectively.
- If ϕ and ψ are formulas, $\phi \vee \psi$ and $\phi \wedge \psi$ are formulas.
- If ϕ is a formula, $t \equiv |u|$ is a sharply bounded term and x is a variable, the form $\forall x \leq t \phi$ is a formula. We say quantifier in the form $\forall x \leq |t|$ sharply bounded.
- If ϕ is a formula, t is a term and x is a variable, the form $\exists x \leq t \phi$ is a formula.

We call a formula in the form $pt_1 \dots t_n$ (p : predicate, $t_1, \dots, t_n$: terms) atomic

Definition 4. *Axioms of S_E^0 are sequents defined as follows.*

E-axioms:

- (1) $\rightarrow E0$
- (2) $Ex \rightarrow Es_i x$
where $i = 0$ or 1 .
- (3) $pt_1 \dots t_n \rightarrow Et_i$
where $i = 1 \dots n$.
- (4) $\neg pt_1 \dots t_n \rightarrow Et_i$
where $i = 1 \dots n$.

Equality axioms:

- (5) $Ex \rightarrow x = x$
- (6) $x = y, y = z \rightarrow x = z$
- (7) $x = y \rightarrow s_i x = s_i y$

where $i = 0$ or 1 .

Separation axioms:

$$(8) \quad x \neq 0 \rightarrow x \neq s_0x$$

$$(9) \quad Ex \rightarrow x \neq s_1x$$

$$(10) \quad Ex \rightarrow s_0x \neq s_1x$$

Inequality axioms:

$$(11) \quad Ex \rightarrow 0 \leq x$$

$$(12) \quad x \leq y \rightarrow s_ix \leq s_iy$$

where $i = 0$ or 1

$$(13) \quad x \leq y \rightarrow s_0x \leq s_1y$$

Defining axioms: *Cond:*

$$(14) \quad Ey, Ez \rightarrow Cond(0, y, z) = y$$

$$(15) \quad ECond(x, y, z) \rightarrow Cond(s_0x, y, z) = Cond(x, y, z)$$

$$(16) \quad Ex, Ey, Ez \rightarrow Cond(s_1x, y, z) = z$$

S:

$$(17) \quad \rightarrow S0 = s_10$$

$$(18) \quad Es_1x \rightarrow Ss_0x = s_1x$$

$$(19) \quad ESx \rightarrow Ss_1x = s_0(Sx)$$

| |:

$$(20) \quad \rightarrow |0| = 0$$

$$(21) \quad ES|x| \rightarrow |s_0x| = Cond(x, 0, S|x|)$$

$$(22) \quad ES|x| \rightarrow |s_1x| = S|x|$$

$\lfloor \frac{\cdot}{2} \rfloor$:

$$(23) \quad \rightarrow \lfloor \frac{0}{2} \rfloor = 0$$

$$(24) \quad Ex \rightarrow \lfloor \frac{1}{2} s_0x \rfloor = x$$

$$(25) \quad Ex \rightarrow \lfloor \frac{1}{2} s_1x \rfloor = x$$

$\boxplus$:

$$(26) \quad Ex \rightarrow x \boxplus 0 = x$$

$$(27) \quad Es_0(x \boxplus y) \rightarrow x \boxplus s_0y = Cond(y, x, s_0(x \boxplus y))$$

$$(28) \quad Es_0(x \boxplus y) \rightarrow x \boxplus s_1y = s_0(x \boxplus y)$$

$\#$:

$$(29) \quad Ex \rightarrow x \# 0 = 1$$

$$(30) \quad E(x \# y) \boxplus x \rightarrow x \# s_0y = Cond(y, 1, (x \# y) \boxplus x)$$

$$(31) \quad E(x \# y) \boxplus x \rightarrow x \# s_1y = (x \# y) \boxplus x$$

parity:

$$(32) \quad \rightarrow \text{parity}(0) = 0$$

$$(33) \quad Ex \rightarrow \text{parity}(s_0x) = 0$$

$$(34) \quad Ex \rightarrow \text{parity}(s_1x) = 1$$

+:

$$(35) \quad Ex \rightarrow x + 0 = x$$

$$(36) \quad E(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}x \rfloor + y) \rightarrow x + s_0y = \text{Cond}(\text{parity}(x), s_0(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}x \rfloor + y), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}x \rfloor + y))$$

$$(37) \quad E(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}x \rfloor + y) \rightarrow x + s_1y = \text{Cond}(\text{parity}(x), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}x \rfloor + y), s_0(S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}x \rfloor + y)))$$

·:

$$(38) \quad Ex \rightarrow x \cdot 0 = 0$$

$$(39) \quad Ex \cdot y \rightarrow x \cdot (s_0y) = s_0(x \cdot y)$$

$$(40) \quad Es_0(x \cdot y) + x \rightarrow x \cdot (s_1y) = s_0(x \cdot y) + x$$

Definition 5. Let $\Gamma(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \Delta(\vec{x})$ be a sequent with free variables $\vec{x}$. Then, substitution instance $\Gamma(\vec{t}) \rightarrow \Delta(\vec{t})$ of $\Gamma(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \Delta(\vec{x})$ is a sequent obtained by substituting terms $\vec{t}$ to free variables $\vec{x}$ in $\Gamma(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \Delta(\vec{x})$.

Definition 6. The inference rules of S_2^0E are defined as follows.

Identity rule:

$$\overline{a \rightarrow a}$$

where a is an atomic formula.

Axioms:

$$\overline{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

if $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ is an substitution instance of axioms defined in Definition 4.

Structural rules: **Weakening rule:**

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}$$

Contraction:

$$\frac{A, A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A, A}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}$$

Exchange:

$$\frac{\Gamma, A, B, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, B, A, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A, B, \Pi}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B, A, \Pi}$$

Logical rules: **$\neg$ -rules:**

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, p(t_1, \dots, t_n)}{\neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

where p is a n -ary predicate.

$$\frac{p(t_1, \dots, t_n), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{Et_1, \dots, Et_n, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)}$$

$\wedge$ -rules:

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A \wedge B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{B \wedge A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \wedge B}$$

$\vee$ -rules:

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \quad B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A \vee B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \vee B}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B \vee A}$$

$\forall$ -rules:

$$\frac{A(t), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{t \leq s, \forall x \leq s. A(x), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

$$\frac{x \leq t, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A(x)}{Nt, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \forall x \leq t. A(x)}$$

where x does not appear in Γ, Δ and t .

$\exists$ -rules:

$$\frac{x \leq t, A(x), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{\exists x \leq t. A(x), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

where x does not appear in Γ, Δ .

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A(t)}{t \leq s, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \exists x \leq s. A(x)}$$

Cut-rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad A, \Pi \rightarrow \Lambda}{\Gamma, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta, \Lambda}$$

3. TRUTH DEFINITION OF $S_2^0 E$

Definition 7. A tree w is $\vec{b}$ -valuation tree of a term $t(\vec{a})$ bounded by u if and only if

- (1) All nodes of w has a form $\langle [t_0], c \rangle$ where $[t_0]$ is a Gödel number of a subterm t_0 of t and $c \leq u$.
- (2) Leafs of w are either in the form $\langle [0], 0 \rangle$ or $\langle [a_i], b_i \rangle$.
- (3) The root of w has a form $\langle [t(\vec{a})], c \rangle$.
- (4) Child nodes of a node $\langle [f(t_1, \dots, t_n)], c \rangle$ are $\langle [t_1], d_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle [t_n], d_n \rangle$ and $c = f(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ holds.

If the roof of $\vec{b}$ -valuation tree w has a form $\langle [t], c \rangle$, we say the value of w is c .

We define $v([t], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c \Leftrightarrow_{\text{def}} \exists w \leq s([t], u)$ "w is a $\vec{b}$ -valuation tree bounded by u and the root of w is $\langle [t], c \rangle$ " where s is a suitable term to bound the size of valuation trees of t bounded by u . Then, $v([t], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c$ is a Σ_1^b -formula.

Lemma 1. The following statements are provable in S_1^2 .

- (1) If w is a $\vec{b}$ -valuation tree bounded by u and $u \leq u'$, w is a $\vec{b}$ -valuation tree bounded by u' .
- (2) $v([t], \rho) \downarrow_u c$ and $u < u'$, then $v([t], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c$.
- (3) $v([t], \rho) \downarrow_u c$ and $v([t], \rho) \downarrow_u c'$, then $c = c'$.

Lemma 2. The following statements are provable in S_1^2 .

- (1) $v([f(t_1(\vec{a}), \dots, t_k(\vec{a}))], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c$ then, $\exists d_1, \dots, d_k, v([t_1(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u d_1, \dots, v([t_k(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u d_k$ and $f(d_1, \dots, d_k) = c$.
- (2) $v([0], \vec{b}) \downarrow_0 0$
- (3) $v([a_j], \vec{b}) \downarrow_{b_j} b_j$
- (4) $v([t(\vec{a}, t'(\vec{a}))], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c \leftrightarrow \exists c' \leq u, v([t'(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c' \wedge v([t(\vec{a}, a)], \vec{b} * c') \downarrow_u c$

Definition 8. Assume that ϕ is a quantifier free formula of $S_2^0 E$. We define $\vec{b}$ -truth tree bounded by u of $\phi(\vec{a})$ as a tree w satisfying the following condition.

- (1) All nodes of w has a form $\langle [\psi], \epsilon \rangle$.
- (2) The root of w has a form $\langle [\phi(\vec{a})], \epsilon \rangle$.
- (3) The leaf of w has a form $\langle [t_1 \leq t_2], \epsilon \rangle$ or $\langle [t_1 \not\leq t_2], \epsilon \rangle$ or $\langle [t_1 = t_2], \epsilon \rangle$ or $\langle [t_1 \neq t_2], \epsilon \rangle$ or $\langle [Et], \epsilon \rangle$. For the case of that the leaf has a form $\langle [t_1 \leq t_2], \epsilon \rangle$, $\epsilon = 1$ if and only if $\exists c_1, c_2 \leq u, v([t_1], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_1, v([t_2], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_2$ and $c_1 \leq c_2$. Otherwise $\epsilon = 0$. For the case of that the leaf has a form $\langle [t_1 \not\leq t_2], \epsilon \rangle$, $\epsilon = 1$ if and only if $\exists c_1, c_2 \leq u, v([t_1], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_1, v([t_2], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_2$ and $c_1 \not\leq c_2$. Otherwise $\epsilon = 0$. For the cases of $\langle [t_1 = t_2], \epsilon \rangle$ or $\langle [t_1 \neq t_2], \epsilon \rangle$, the conditions are similar. For the case that the leaf is $\langle [Et], \epsilon \rangle$, $\epsilon = 1$ if and only if $\exists c \leq u, v([t], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c$. Otherwise $\epsilon = 0$.
- (4) If the node r of w has a form $\langle [\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2], \epsilon \rangle$, r has child nodes $\langle [\phi_1], \epsilon_1 \rangle$, $\langle [\phi_2], \epsilon_2 \rangle$ and $\epsilon = 1$ if and only if $\epsilon_1 = 1$ and $\epsilon_2 = 1$. Otherwise $\epsilon = 0$.
- (5) If the node r of w has a form $\langle [\phi_1 \vee \phi_2], \epsilon \rangle$, r has child nodes $\langle [\phi_1], \epsilon_1 \rangle$, $\langle [\phi_2], \epsilon_2 \rangle$ and $\epsilon = 1$ if and only if $\epsilon_1 = 1$ or $\epsilon_2 = 1$. Otherwise $\epsilon = 0$.

We define $T_0(u, [\phi(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \Leftrightarrow_{\text{def}} \exists w \leq s([\phi(\vec{a})], u)$, "w is a $\vec{b}$ -truth tree bounded by u and the root of w has a form $\langle [\phi(\vec{a})], 1 \rangle$." where s is a suitable term bound the size of w by t and u . Then, $T_0(u, [\phi(\vec{a})], \vec{b})$ is a Σ_1^b -formula.

Lemma 3. S_2^1 proves the following statements.

- (1) $T_0(u, [t_1 \leq t_2], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow \exists c_1, c_2 \leq u, v([t_1], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_1 \wedge v([t_2], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_2 \wedge c_1 \leq c_2$
- (2) $T_0(u, [t_1 \not\leq t_2], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow \exists c_1, c_2 \leq u, v([t_1], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_1 \wedge v([t_2], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_2 \wedge c_1 \not\leq c_2$
- (3) $T_0(u, [t_1 = t_2], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow \exists c_1, c_2 \leq u, v([t_1], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_1 \wedge v([t_2], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_2 \wedge c_1 = c_2$
- (4) $T_0(u, [t_1 \neq t_2], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow \exists c_1, c_2 \leq u, v([t_1], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_1 \wedge v([t_2], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c_2 \wedge c_1 \neq c_2$
- (5) $T_0(u, [Et], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow \exists c \leq u, v([t], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c$
- (6) $T_0(u, [\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow T_0(u, [\phi_1], \vec{b}) \wedge T_0(u, [\phi_2], \vec{b})$
- (7) $T_0(u, [\phi_1 \vee \phi_2], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow T_0(u, [\phi_1], \vec{b}) \vee T_0(u, [\phi_2], \vec{b})$
- (8) $T_0(u, [\phi(\vec{a}, t(\vec{a}))], \vec{b}) \leftrightarrow \exists c \leq u, v([t(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c \wedge T_0(u, [\phi(\vec{a}, a)], \vec{b} * c)$
- (9) $T_0(u, [\phi], \vec{b}), u \leq u' \rightarrow T_0(u', [\phi], \vec{b})$

Proof. Only (8) is non-trivial. (8) is proved by induction on the construction of ϕ . Using (6), (7), it is proved by considering the case where ϕ is atomic. But if ϕ is atomic, the proof is handled by Clause (4) of Lemma 2. $\square$

Lemma 4. If $T_0(u, [t_1], \rho), \dots, T_0(u, [t_n], \rho)$, then either $T(u, [p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$ or $T(u, [\neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$ holds.

Definition 9. $\phi(\vec{a})$ is called pure 1-form if and only if it has a form

$$\exists x_1 \leq t_1(\vec{a}) \forall x_2 \leq |t_2(\vec{a}, x_1)| A(\vec{a}, x_1, x_2)$$

where A is quantifier-free and does not contain predicate E .

Formula ψ are called 1-form if it is subformula of a formula in pure 1-form, i.e.

- ψ is in pure 1-form, or
- ψ has a form $\forall x \leq |t(\vec{a})| A(\vec{a}, x)$ where A is quantifier-free and does not contain predicate E , or
- ψ is quantifier-free and does not contain predicate E .

Definition 10. $T(u, [\phi(\vec{a})], \vec{b})$ is defined as the formula stating “ $[\phi(\vec{a})]$ is a Gödel number of 1-form or formula in a form Et and one of the following clauses holds.

- $\phi(\vec{a})$ is in the form $\exists x_1 \leq t_1(\vec{a}) \forall x_2 \leq |t_2(\vec{a}, x_1)| A(\vec{a}, x_1, x_2)$. Moreover $\exists c \leq u, v([t_1(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c$ and $\exists x_1 \leq c, \exists d \leq u, v([t_2(\vec{a}, x_1)], \vec{b} * x_1) \downarrow_u d$ and $\forall x_2 \leq |d|, T_0(u, [A(\vec{a}, x_1, x_2)], \vec{b} * x_1 * x_2)$ holds.
- $\phi(\vec{a})$ is in the form $\forall x \leq |t(\vec{a})| A(\vec{a}, x)$. Moreover $\exists c \leq u, v([t(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \downarrow_u c$ and $\forall x \leq |c|, T_0(u, [A(\vec{a}, x)], \vec{b} * x)$ holds.
- $\phi(\vec{a})$ is quantifier-free. Then $T_0(u, [\phi(\vec{a})], \vec{b})$ holds.”

$T(u, [\phi(\vec{a})], \vec{b})$ is Σ_1^b -formula.

Lemma 5. S_2^1 proves $T(u, [\phi(\vec{a})], \vec{b}) \wedge u \leq u' \rightarrow T(u', [\phi(\vec{a})], \vec{b})$

4. SOUNDNESS AND CONSISTENCY PROOF OF $S_2^0 E$ IN S_2^2

Definition 11. A proof p of $S_2^0 E$ is strictly 1-normal if and only if

- (1) All formulas of p is either 1-form or has a form Et .
- (2) p is a free variable normal form.

The property “ w is a Gödel number of strictly 1-normal proof of sequent $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ ” is Δ_1^b -definable property. We write $1 - sPrf(w, [\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta])$ the formula representing this property.

Proposition 1. Assume $1 - sPrf(w, [\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta])$. For each node r of w , we write the sequent of this node $\Gamma_r \rightarrow \Delta_r$ and number of parameter variables in $\Gamma_r \rightarrow \Delta_r$ k_r . Then, for each node r of w and any u , the following hold.

$$(41) \quad \forall \rho \leq u \# 2^{k_r} (seq(\rho) \wedge Len(\rho) = k_r \wedge \forall i < k_r (\beta(i+1, \rho) \leq u)) \supset \\ \forall u' \leq u \ominus r \forall A \in \Gamma_r \ T(u', [A], \rho) \supset \exists B \in \Delta_r \ T(u' \oplus r, [B], \rho)$$

where $\ominus$ is a bit-subtraction and $\oplus$ is a bit-concatenation.

Furthermore, this is derivable in S_2^2 .

Proof. Tree induction on w . Note that the formula (41) is Σ_2^b -formula. Hence, S_2^2 can formalize this induction. We reason informally inside S_2^2 .

We distinguish different cases of the inference deriving $\Gamma_r \rightarrow \Delta_r$.

Identity rule:

$$\overline{a \rightarrow a}$$

Let $\rho \leq u \# 2^{k_r}$ and assume $Seq(\rho)$, $Len(\rho) = k_r$, $\forall i < k_r \beta(i+1, \rho) \leq u$.

Let $u' \leq u \ominus r$. Further, assume that $T(u', [a], \rho)$. Then, by Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [a], \rho)$. Hence, r satisfies (41).

Axioms: We distinguish different cases based on which axiom the sequent is a substitution instance of. Let $\rho \leq u \# 2^{k_r}$ and assume $Seq(\rho)$, $Len(\rho) = k_r$, $\forall i < k_r \beta(i+1, \rho) \leq u$. Let $u' \leq u \ominus r$.

E-axioms:

$$\rightarrow E0$$

Since $v([0], \rho) \downarrow_0 0$, $T(u' \oplus r, [E0], \rho)$. Hence r satisfies (41).

$$Et \rightarrow Es_it$$

for $i = 0, 1$. Assume $T(u', [Et], \rho)$ i.e. $\exists c \leq u'v([t], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c$. Then $v([s_it], \rho) \downarrow_{s_i u'} s_i c$. Hence $T(s_i u', [Es_it], \rho)$. Since $s_i u' \leq u' \oplus r$, $T(u' \oplus r, [Es_it], \rho)$. Hence r satisfies (41).

$$pt_1 \dots t_n \rightarrow Et_i$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume $T(u', [pt_1 \dots t_n], \rho)$. By definition 10 of T , $T_0(u', [pt_1 \dots t_n], \rho)$. By definition 8 of T_0 , there is ρ -truth tree w bounded by u . Only node of w consists of $\langle [pt_1 \dots t_n], 1 \rangle$. By definition it is the case only when $\exists c \leq u'v([t_i], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c$. Hence $T(u', [Et_i], \rho)$. By Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [Et_i], \rho)$. Hence r satisfies (41).

The case

$$\neg pt_1 \dots t_n \rightarrow Et_i$$

is treated similarly as above.

Equality axioms:

$$Et \rightarrow t = t$$

Assume that $T(u', [Et], \rho)$. Then, $\exists c \leq u'v([t], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c$. Since $c = c$, there is ρ -truth tree w bounded by u which consists of single node $\langle [t = t], 1 \rangle$. Hence $T_0(u', [t = t], \rho)$ and therefore $T(u', [t = t], \rho)$. By Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [t = t], \rho)$. Hence r satisfies (41).

$$t_1 = t_2, t_2 = t_3 \rightarrow t_1 = t_3$$

Assume that $T(u', [t_1 = t_2], \rho)$ and $T(u', [t_2 = t_3], \rho)$. Then, $\exists c_1 \leq u'v([t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_1$, $\exists c_2 \leq u'v([t_2], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_2$, $\exists c_3 \leq u'v([t_3], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_3$ and $c_1 = c_2$, $c_2 = c_3$. Hence $c_1 = c_3$. Since $v([t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_1$ and $v([t_3], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_3$, $T(u', [t_1 = t_3], \rho)$. By Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [t_1 = t_3], \rho)$. Hence r satisfies (41).

$$t_1 = t_2 \rightarrow s_i t_1 = s_i t_2$$

where $i = 0, 1$. Assume $T(u', [t_1 = t_2], \rho)$. Then, $\exists c_1 \leq u'v([t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_1$, $\exists c_2 \leq u'v([t_2], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_2$ and $c_1 = c_2$. Hence $v([s_i t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{s_i u'} s_i c_1$, $v([s_i t_2], \rho) \downarrow_{s_i u'} s_i c_2$ and $s_i c_1 = s_i c_2$ can be proved by the axiom of S_2^2 . Therefore, $T(s_i u', [s_i t_1 = s_i t_2], \rho)$. By $s_i u' \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [s_i t_1 = s_i t_2], \rho)$. Hence r satisfies (41).

Separation axioms:

$$Et \rightarrow t \neq s_1 t$$

Assume $T(u', [Et], \rho)$ i.e. $\exists c \leq u'v([t], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c$. Thus $v([s_1 t], \rho) \downarrow_{s_1 u'} s_1 c$ and by clause (2) of Lemma 1, $v([t], \rho) \downarrow_{s_1 u'} c$. Since $c \neq s_1 c$, $T(s_1 u', [t \neq s_1 t], \rho)$. Since $s_1 u' \leq u' \oplus r$ and Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [t \neq s_1 t], \rho)$.

The cases of s_0 ad $Et \rightarrow s_0 t \neq s_1 t$ are similar.

Inequality axioms:

$$Et \rightarrow 0 \leq t$$

Assume $T(u', [Et], \rho)$ i.e. $\exists c \leq u'v([t], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c$. $0 \leq c$, and hence $T(u', [0 \leq t], \rho)$. By Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [0 \leq t], \rho)$.

$$t_1 \leq t_2 \rightarrow s_i t_1 \leq s_i t_2$$

where $i = 0, 1$. Assume $T(u', [t_1 \leq t_2], \rho)$. Then, $\exists c_1 \leq u'v([t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_1$, $\exists c_2 \leq u'v([t_2], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_2$ and $c_1 \leq c_2$. Hence, $v([s_i t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{s_i u'} s_i c_1$ and $v([s_i t_2], \rho) \downarrow_{s_i u'} s_i c_2$. Since $s_i c_1 \leq s_i c_2$, $T(s_i u', [s_i t_1 \leq s_i t_2], \rho)$. Since $s_i u' \leq u' \oplus r$, $T(u' \oplus r, [s_i t_1 \leq s_i t_2], \rho)$.

$$t_1 \leq t_2 \rightarrow s_0 t_1 \leq s_1 t_2$$

where $i = 0, 1$. Assume $T(u', [t_1 \leq t_2], \rho)$. Then, $\exists c_1 \leq u'v([t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_1$, $\exists c_2 \leq u'v([t_2], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c_2$ and $c_1 \leq c_2$. Hence, $v([s_0 t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{s_0 u'} s_0 c_1$ and $v([s_1 t_2], \rho) \downarrow_{s_1 u'} s_1 c_2$. Since $s_0 c_1 \leq s_1 c_2$, $T(s_1 u', [s_0 t_1 \leq s_1 t_2], \rho)$. Since $s_1 u' \leq u' \oplus r$, $T(u' \oplus r, [s_0 t_1 \leq s_1 t_2], \rho)$.

Defining axioms *Cond*:

$$Et_1, Et_2 \rightarrow \text{Cond}(0, t_1, t_2) = t_1$$

Assume that $T(u', [Et_1], \rho)$ and $T(u', [Et_2], \rho)$. Therefore we have a ρ -evaluation tree w_1 of term t_1 and w_2 of t_2 . Using w_1 and w_2 , we can construct ρ -evaluation tree of $\text{Cond}(0, t_1, t_2)$. Hence, $\exists c \leq u'v([\text{Cond}(0, t_1, t_2)], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} c$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2, $v([t_1], \rho) \downarrow_{u'} d$ and $d = c$. Hence, $T(u', [\text{Cond}(0, t_1, t_2) = t_1], \rho)$ holds. Since $u' \leq u' \oplus r$ and Lemma 5, we have $T(u' \oplus r, [\text{Cond}(0, t_1, t_2) = t_1], \rho)$.

$$E\text{Cond}(t_1, t_2, t_3) \rightarrow \text{Cond}(s_0 t_1, t_2, t_3) = \text{Cond}(t_1, t_2, t_3)$$

Assume that $T(u', [E\text{Cond}(t_1, t_2, t_3)], \rho)$. Then, we have a ρ -valuation tree of t_1, t_2, t_3 bounded by u' respectively. Therefore, we can construct a ρ -valuation tree of $\text{Cond}(s_0 t_1, t_2, t_3)$ bounded by $s_0 u'$. Hence we have $\exists c_1 \leq s_0 u' v([\text{Cond}(s_0 t_1, t_2, t_3)], \rho) \downarrow_{s_0 u'} c_1$. Moreover $\exists c_2 \leq s_0 u' v([\text{Cond}(t_1, t_2, t_3)], \rho) \downarrow_{s_0 u'} c_2$ by clause (2) of Lemma 1. By clause (1) of Lemma 2, $c_1 = c_2$. Hence $T(s_0 u' [\text{Cond}(s_0 t_1, t_2, t_3) = \text{Cond}(t_1, t_2, t_3)], \rho)$. By $s_0 u' \leq u' \oplus r$ and Lemma 5, we have $T(u' \oplus r, [\text{Cond}(s_0 t_1, t_2, t_3) = \text{Cond}(t_1, t_2, t_3)], \rho)$.

$$Et_1, Et_2, Et_3 \rightarrow \text{Cond}(s_1 t_1, t_2, t_3) = t_3$$

Assume $T(u', [Et_1], \rho), T(u', [Et_2], \rho), T(u', [Et_3], \rho)$. Then, we have a ρ -valuation w_1, w_2, w_3 tree of t_1, t_2, t_3 bounded by u' respectively. Hence, ρ -valuation tree w of $\text{Cond}(s_1 t_1, t_2, t_3)$ bounded by $s_1 u'$ can be constructed from w_1, w_2, w_3 . Let c be the value of w . By clause (1) of Lemma 1, w_3 is still a ρ -valuation tree bounded by $s_1 u'$. Hence $T(s_1 u', [\text{Cond}(s_1 t_1, t_2, t_3) = t_3], \rho)$. Since $s_1 u' \leq u' \oplus r$ and Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [\text{Cond}(s_1 t_1, t_2, t_3) = t_3], \rho)$.

Defining axioms S :

$$\rightarrow S0 = s_1 0$$

Since $T(1, [S0 = s_1 0], \rho)$, we have done.

$$Es_1 t \rightarrow Ss_0 t = s_1 t$$

By $T(u', [Es_1 t], \rho)$, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of $s_1 t$ bounded by u' . Using w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree of $Ss_0 t$ and $s_1 t$ bounded by u' . By clause (1) of Lemma 2, values of both trees are equal. Hence $T(u', [Ss_0 t = s_1 t], \rho)$. Since $u' \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5, we have done.

$$Est \rightarrow Ss_1 t = s_0(St)$$

By $T(u', [Est], \rho)$, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of St bounded by u' . Using w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $Ss_1 t$ and w_2 of $s_0(St)$ bounded by $s_0 u'$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2, values of both trees are equal. Hence $T(s_0 u', [Ss_1 t = s_0(St)], \rho)$. Since $s_0 u' \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5, we have done.

Defining axioms $|$:

$$\rightarrow |0| = 0$$

Since $T(0, [|0| = 0], \rho)$, by Lemma 5 we have done.

$$ES|t| \rightarrow |s_0 t| = \text{Cond}(t, 0, S|t|)$$

By $T(u', [ES|t|], \rho)$, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . From w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $|s_0 t|$ and w_2 of $\text{Cond}(t, 0, S|t|)$ bounded by $s_0 u'$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2, the values of w_1 and w_2 are equal. Hence, $T(s_0 u', [|s_0 t| = \text{Cond}(t, 0, S|t|)], \rho)$. Since $s_0 u' \leq u \oplus r$, by Lemma 5 $T(u' \oplus r, [|s_0 t| = \text{Cond}(t, 0, S|t|)], \rho)$.

$$ES|t| \rightarrow |s_1 t| = S|t|$$

Analogous to the proof above.

Defining axioms $\lfloor \frac{\cdot}{2} \rfloor$:

$$\rightarrow \lfloor \frac{0}{2} \rfloor = 0$$

Since $T(2, \lceil \lfloor \frac{0}{2} \rfloor = 0 \rceil, \rho)$, we have done.

$$Et \rightarrow \lfloor \frac{1}{2} s_0 t \rfloor = t$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil Et \rceil, \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . From w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $\lfloor \frac{1}{2} s_0 t \rfloor$ bounded by $s_0 u'$. By clause (1) of Lemma 1, w is a ρ -valuation tree bounded by $s_0 u'$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2, the values of w_1 and w are equal. Hence $T(s_0 u', \lceil \lfloor \frac{1}{2} s_0 t \rfloor = t \rceil, \rho)$. Since $s_0 u' \leq u \oplus r$, by Lemma 5 $T(u' \oplus r, \lceil \lfloor \frac{1}{2} s_0 t \rfloor = t \rceil, \rho)$.

$$Et \rightarrow \lfloor \frac{1}{2} s_1 t \rfloor = t$$

Analogous to the proof above.

Defining axioms $\boxplus$:

$$Et \rightarrow t \boxplus 0 = t$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil Et \rceil, \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . Hence we have an ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $t \boxplus 0$ bounded by u' . By clause (1) of Lemma 2, both values of w and w_1 are equal. Hence $T(u', \lceil t \boxplus 0 = t \rceil, \rho)$. By Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, \lceil t \boxplus 0 = t \rceil, \rho)$.

$$Es_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2) \rightarrow t_1 \boxplus s_0 t_2 = Cond(t_2, t_1, s_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2))$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil Es_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2) \rceil, \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of $Es_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2)$ bounded by u' . By manipulating w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $t_1 \boxplus s_0 t_2$ and w_2 of $Cond(t_2, t_1, s_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2))$ bounded by u' . By clause (1) of Lemma 2, the values of w_1 and w_2 are equal. Hence $T(u', \lceil t_1 \boxplus s_0 t_2 = Cond(t_2, t_1, s_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2)) \rceil, \rho)$. By $u' \leq u' \oplus r$ and Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, \lceil t_1 \boxplus s_0 t_2 = Cond(t_2, t_1, s_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2)) \rceil, \rho)$.

$$Es_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2) \rightarrow t_1 \boxplus s_1 t_2 = s_0(t_1 \boxplus t_2)$$

Analogous to the proof above.

Defining axioms $\#$:

$$Et \rightarrow t \# 0 = 1$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil Et \rceil, \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . From w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $t \# 0$ bounded by u' . By axioms (of S_2^2), the value of w_1 is 1. The valuation tree w_2 of 1 is bounded by 1. Hence $T(max\{u', 1\}, \lceil t \# 0 = 1 \rceil, \rho)$. Since $max\{u', 1\} \leq u' \oplus \rho$, by Lemma 5 $T(u' \oplus \rho, \lceil t \# 0 = 1 \rceil, \rho)$.

$$E(t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1 \rightarrow t_1 \# s_0 t_2 = Cond(t_2, 1, (t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1)$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil E(t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1 \rceil, \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of $(t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1$ bounded by u' . Manipulating w , we have ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $t_1 \# s_0 t_2$ bounded by $max\{s_0 u', 1\}$ and a ρ -valuation tree

w_2 of $Cond(t_2, 1, (t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1)$ bounded by $\max\{s_0 u', 1\}$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2 and axioms of S_2^2 , the values of w_1 and w_2 are equal. Hence $T(\max\{s_0 u', 1\}, [t_1 \# s_0 t_2 = Cond(t_2, 1, (t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1)], \rho)$. Since $\max\{s_0 u', 1\} \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5 we have $T(u' \oplus r, [t_1 \# s_0 t_2 = Cond(t_2, 1, (t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1)], \rho)$.

$$E(t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1 \rightarrow t_1 \# s_1 t_2 = (t_1 \# t_2) \boxplus t_1$$

Analogous to the proof above.

Defining axioms *parity*:

$$\rightarrow \text{parity}(0) = 0$$

Since $T(0, [\text{parity}(0) = 0], \rho)$, we have done.

$$Et \rightarrow \text{parity}(s_0 t) = 0$$

Assume $T(u', [Et], \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . From w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $\text{parity}(s_0 t)$ bounded by $s_0 u'$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2 we can reason that the value of w_1 equals 0. Hence we have $T(s_0 u', [\text{parity}(s_0 t) = 0], \rho)$. Since $s_0 u' \leq u' \oplus r$ and by Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [\text{parity}(s_0 t) = 0], \rho)$.

$$Et \rightarrow \text{parity}(s_1 t) = 1$$

Assume $T(u', [Et], \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . From w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $\text{parity}(s_1 t)$ bounded by $\max\{s_1 u', 1\}$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2, the value of w_1 equals 1. Hence we have $T(\max\{s_1 u', 1\}, [\text{parity}(s_1 t) = 1], \rho)$. Since $\max\{s_1 u', 1\} \leq u' \oplus r$, $T(u' \oplus r, [\text{parity}(s_1 t) = 1], \rho)$ by Lemma 5.

Defining axioms *+*:

$$Et \rightarrow t + 0 = t$$

Assume $T(u', [Et], \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . From w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $t + 0$ bounded by u' . By axioms (of S_2^2), the value of w_1 equals to w . Hence $T(u', [t + 0 = t], \rho)$. Since $u' \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5 $T(u' \oplus r, [t + 0 = t], \rho)$.

$$E(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2) \rightarrow t_1 + s_0 t_2 = Cond(\text{parity}(t_1), s_0(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2))$$

Assume $T(u', [E(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2)], \rho)$. Then we have ρ -valuation tree w of $\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2$ bounded by u' . Then, we can construct ρ -valuation trees w_1 of $t_1 + s_0 t_2$ and w_2 of $Cond(\text{parity}(t_1), s_0(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2))$ bounded by $s_1 u'$. By clause (1) of Lemma 2, the values of w_1 and w_2 are equal. Hence $T(s_1 u', [t_1 + s_0 t_2 = Cond(\text{parity}(t_1), s_0(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2))], \rho)$. Since $s_1 u' \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [t_1 + s_0 t_2 = Cond(\text{parity}(t_1), s_0(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2} t_1 \rfloor + t_2))], \rho)$.

$$E(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2) \rightarrow t_1 + s_1t_2 = \text{Cond}(\text{parity}(t_1), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_0(S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2)))$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil E(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2) \rceil, \rho)$. Then we have ρ -valuation tree w of $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2$ bounded by u' . Then, we can construct ρ -valuation trees w_1 of $t_1 + s_1t_2$ and w_2 of $\text{Cond}(\text{parity}(t_1), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_0(S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2)))$ bounded by $s_0(Su')$. Hence we have $T(s_0(Su'), \lceil t_1 + s_1t_2 = \text{Cond}(\text{parity}(t_1), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_0(S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2))) \rceil, \rho)$. By $s_0(Su') \leq u' \oplus r$ and Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, \lceil t_1 + s_1t_2 = \text{Cond}(\text{parity}(t_1), s_1(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2), s_0(S(\lfloor \frac{1}{2}t_1 \rfloor + t_2))) \rceil, \rho)$.

Defining axioms :

$$Et \rightarrow t \cdot 0 = 0$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil Et \rceil, \rho)$. Then, we have an ρ -valuation tree w of t bounded by u' . From w , we can construct ρ -valuation tree w_1 of $t \cdot 0$ bounded by u' . By axioms (of S_2^2), the value of w_1 equals to 0. Hence $T(u', \lceil t \cdot 0 = 0 \rceil, \rho)$. Since $u' \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5 $T(u' \oplus r, \lceil t \cdot 0 = 0 \rceil, \rho)$.

$$Et_1 \cdot t_2 \rightarrow t_1 \cdot (s_0t_2) = s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2)$$

Assume $T(u', \lceil Et_1 \cdot t_2 \rceil, \rho)$. Then, we have ρ -valuation tree w of $t_1 \cdot t_2$ bounded by u' . Hence we have ρ -valuation trees w_1 of $t_1 \cdot (s_0t_2)$ and w_2 of $s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2)$ bounded by s_0u' . By clause (1) of Lemma 2 and axioms of S_2^2 , the values of w_1 and w_2 are equal. Hence $T(s_0u', \lceil t_1 \cdot (s_0t_2) = s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) \rceil, \rho)$. Since $s_0u' \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5 $T(u' \oplus r, \lceil t_1 \cdot (s_0t_2) = s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) \rceil, \rho)$.

$$Es_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) + t_1 \rightarrow t_1 \cdot (s_1t_2) = s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) + t_1$$

Assume that $T(u', \lceil Es_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) + t_1 \rceil, \rho)$. Then we have ρ -evaluation w of term $s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) + t_1$ bounded by u' . By rearranging tree w and using axioms of S_2^2 , we have ρ -valuation trees w' of term $t_1 \cdot (s_1t_2)$ bounded by u' . By axioms of S_2^2 , values of w and w' are equal. Hence, $T(u', \lceil t_1 \cdot (s_1t_2) = s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) + t_1 \rceil, \rho)$. By Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, \lceil t_1 \cdot (s_1t_2) = s_0(t_1 \cdot t_2) + t_1 \rceil, \rho)$.

Structural rules: Weakening:

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

By induction hypothesis, (41) holds for the assumption. Hence (41) trivially holds for the conclusion.

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}$$

By induction hypothesis, (41) holds for the assumption. Hence (41) trivially holds for the conclusion.

Contraction:

$$\frac{A, A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

By induction hypothesis, (41) holds for the assumption. Hence (41) trivially holds for the conclusion.

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A, A}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}$$

By induction hypothesis, (41) holds for the assumption. Hence (41) trivially holds for the conclusion.

Exchange:

$$\frac{\Gamma, A, B, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, B, A, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta}$$

By induction hypothesis, (41) holds for the assumption. Hence (41) trivially holds for the conclusion.

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A, B, \Pi}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B, A, \Pi}$$

By induction hypothesis, (41) holds for the assumption. Hence (41) trivially holds for the conclusion.

Logical rules: $\neg$ -rules:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \end{array} \quad \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, p(t_1, \dots, t_n)}{\neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

By induction hypothesis, (41) holds for the assumption. To prove (41) for the conclusion, we first assume that $\forall A \in \Gamma \ T(u', [A], \rho)$ and $T(u', [\neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$. By induction hypothesis, Either $\exists B \in \Delta \ T(u' \oplus r_1, [B], \rho)$ or $T(u' \oplus r_1, [p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$. But from hypothesis and Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r_1, [p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$. Hence, if we have $T(u', [\neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$ then contradiction. Hence $\exists B \in \Delta \ T(u' \oplus r_1, [B], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5, we have done.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \end{array} \quad \frac{p(t_1, \dots, t_n), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{Et_1, \dots, Et_n, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)}}{Et_1, \dots, Et_n, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)}$$

Assume $\forall A \in \Gamma \ T(u', [A], \rho)$ and $T(u', [Et_i], \rho)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. If $\exists B \in \Delta \ T(u' \oplus r, [A], \rho)$, we have done. So assume otherwise. Then $\forall B \in \Delta, \ T(u' \oplus r_1, [A], \rho)$ does not hold. Hence, by induction hypothesis, $T(u', [p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$ does not hold. Therefore, by Lemma 4 and hypothesis, $T(u', [\neg p(t_1, \dots, t_n)], \rho)$ does holds. Hence we have done.

$\wedge$ -rules:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \end{array} \quad \frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A \wedge B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}}{A \wedge B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

By Lemma 3, $T(u', [A \wedge B], \rho)$ implies $T(u', [A], \rho)$. Hence, by induction hypothesis, $\exists C \in \Delta$ such that $T(u' \oplus r_1, [C], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5, we have done.

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{B \wedge A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

This case is proved similarly as above.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_2 \end{array} \quad \frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \quad \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \wedge B}}$$

Assume $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$. By induction hypothesis, either $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$ or $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A], \rho)$. For the former case, since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u' \oplus r$, by Lemma 5, we have done. Otherwise, $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A], \rho)$. By induction hypothesis, either $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_2, [D], \rho)$ or $T(u' \oplus r_2, [B], \rho)$. For the former case, again since $u' \oplus r_2 \leq u' \oplus r$, we have done. Otherwise, $T(u' \oplus r_2, [B], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1, u' \oplus r_2 \leq u' \oplus r$, $T(u' \oplus r, [A], \rho)$ and $T(u' \oplus r, [B], \rho)$. Hence, by Lemma 3 and the definition of T , $T(u' \oplus r, [A \wedge B], \rho)$.

$\vee$ -rules:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_2 \end{array} \quad \frac{A, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \quad B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{A \vee B, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}}$$

It suffices to show that if $T(u', [A \vee B], \rho)$ and $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$ then $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u', [D], \rho)$. Assume that $T(u', [A \vee B], \rho)$ and $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$. By definition of T and Lemma 3, $T(u', [A \vee B], \rho)$ is equivalent to $T(u', [A], \rho)$ or $T(u', [B], \rho)$. Hence, by induction hypothesis, either $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$ or $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_2, [D], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1, u' \oplus r_2 \leq u' \oplus r$, we have $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r, [D], \rho)$.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \end{array} \quad \frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \vee B}}$$

Assume $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$. By induction hypothesis, either $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$ or $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A], \rho)$. If $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$, then since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u' \oplus r$, we have done. Otherwise, $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A], \rho)$. By definition of T and Lemma 3, we have $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A \vee B], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u' \oplus r$, we have done.

$$\frac{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A}{\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, B \vee A}$$

The proof is similar as above.

$\forall$ -rules:

$$\frac{\text{infer} * [r_1]A(t), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}{t \leq s, \forall x \leq s.A(x), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

Assume that C satisfies $T(u', [C], \rho)$ if C is a formula in $t \leq s, \forall x \leq s.A(x), \Gamma$. Then, there are c, d such that $v(\lceil t \rceil) \downarrow'_u c$, $v(\lceil s \rceil) \downarrow'_u d$ and $c \leq d$. Since the proof w is a 1-normal proof, in $\forall x \leq s.A(x)$, s has a form $|s'|$. By assumption, $T(u', [\forall x \leq s.A(x)], \rho)$. By Definition 10, $\exists d' \leq u', v(u', [s'], \rho)$ and $\forall x \leq |d'|, T_0(u', [A(x)], \rho * x)$. By Lemma 2, $d = |d'|$. Hence, $c \leq |d'|$. Therefore, $T_0(u', [A(x)], \rho * c)$. By Lemma 3, $T_0(u', [A(t)], \rho)$. By Definition 10, $T(u', [A(t)], \rho)$. Combining the fact that $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$, by induction hypothesis of r_1 , $\exists D \in \Delta$

$\Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u' \oplus r$ and by Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [D], \rho)$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \\ x \leq t, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A(x) \end{array}}{Nt, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \forall x \leq t. A(x)}$$

where x does not appear in Γ, Δ and t .

Assume $T(u', [Nt], \rho)$ and $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$. Then, by the first assumption, $\exists c \leq u'. v(u', [t], \rho) \downarrow'_u c$. let d be any natural number satisfying $d \leq c$. Then, $T(u', [x \leq t], \rho * d)$ and since x does not occur in Γ , $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho * d)$. By induction hypothesis on r_1 , either $\exists D \in \Delta T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho * d)$ or $T(u', [A(x)], \rho * d)$.

$\exists$ -rules:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \\ x \leq t, A(x), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta \end{array}}{\exists x \leq t. A(x), \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta}$$

where x does not appear in Γ, Δ .

Assume $T(u', [\exists x \leq t. A(x)], \rho)$ and $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$. By definition of T , $\exists c \leq u'$ such that $v([t], \rho) \downarrow'_u c$ and $\exists d \leq c, T(u', [A(x)], \rho * d)$. Since x does not appears in Γ , $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho * d)$. By induction hypothesis on r_1 , $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho * d)$. Since D does not have x as a free variable, $T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u' \oplus r$ and by Lemma 5, $T(u' \oplus r, [D], \rho)$.

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \\ \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A(t) \end{array}}{t \leq s, \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, \exists x \leq s. A(x)}$$

Assume that $T(u', [t \leq s], \rho)$ and $\forall C \in \Gamma, T(u', [C], \rho)$. By induction hypothesis on r_1 , either $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$ or $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A(t)], \rho)$. If $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [D], \rho)$, we have done by Lemma 3. Hence, assume $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A(t)], \rho)$. By Lemma 2, $\exists c. v([t], \rho) \downarrow_{u' \oplus r_1} c$ and $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A(x)], \rho * c)$. Since $T(u', [t \leq s], \rho)$, $\exists d. v([s], \rho) \downarrow'_u d$ and $c \leq d$. Therefore, by definition of T , $T(u' \oplus r_1, [\exists x \leq s. A(x)], \rho)$.

Cut-rule:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_1 \\ \Gamma \rightarrow \Delta, A \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ r_2 \\ A, \Pi \rightarrow \Lambda \end{array}}{\Gamma, \Pi \rightarrow \Delta, \Lambda}$$

Assume $\forall C \in \Gamma, \Pi, T(u', [C], \rho)$. By induction hypothesis on r_1 , either $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [C], \rho)$ or $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A], \rho)$. If $\exists D \in \Delta, T(u' \oplus r_1, [C], \rho)$ then $T(u' \oplus r, [C], \rho)$ by Lemma 5, therefore we have done. Hence, we assume that $T(u' \oplus r_1, [A], \rho)$. By assumption and Lemma 5, $\forall C \in \Pi, T(u' \oplus r_1, [C], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1 \leq u \oplus r_2$, we can apply induction hypothesis to $u' \oplus r_1$. Hence, we have $\exists D \in \Lambda, T(u' \oplus r_1 \oplus r_2, [D], \rho)$. Since $u' \oplus r_1 \oplus r_2 \leq u' \oplus r$, $\exists D \in \Lambda, T(u' \oplus r, [D], \rho)$ by Lemma 5. Hence we have done. $\square$

Theorem 1. $S_2^2 \vdash \forall w \neg 1 - \text{Prf}(w, [\rightarrow])$

Proof. Immediate from Proposition 1. □

5. CONJECTURES

In this section, we discuss several conjectures concerning $S_2^0 E$.

The most interesting problem concerning $S_2^0 E$ is whether S_1^2 proves $\forall w \neg 1 - \text{Prf}(w, [\rightarrow])$ or not. If the answer is negative, we have $S_1^2 \neq S_2^2$, hence the fundamental problem of bounded arithmetic is solved.

It would be easier to prove

$$S_1^2 \not\vdash \forall w \neg \text{Prf}(w, [\rightarrow])$$

allowing any formula in the proof, since Solovay's cut shortening technique would work. To use Solovay's cut shortening technique, we need to convert S_1^2 proof to $S_2^0 E$ proof with Σ_1^b -PIND. This is achieved another conjecture. Let $\phi(\vec{x})$ be a Σ_1^b -formula with free variables $\vec{x} = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$. Assume $S_1^2 \vdash \phi(\vec{x})$. Then, we conjecture $S_0^2 E + \Sigma_1^b - \text{PIND} \vdash N\vec{x} \rightarrow \phi(\vec{x})$, where $N\vec{x}$ stands for the sequent $Nx_1, Nx_2, \dots, Nx_n$. This is plausible because $S_0^2 E$ contains all inductive definition necessary to prove totality and uniqueness of functions and predicates.

REFERENCES

- [1] Samuel R. Buss and Aleksandar Ignjatović, *Unprovability of consistency statements in fragments of bounded arithmetic*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **74** (1995), 221–244.
- [2] Samuel R. Buss, *Bounded arithmetic*, Bibliopolis, 1986.
- [3] P. Pudlák, *A note on bounded arithmetic*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **136** (1990), 85–89.
- [4] Gaisi Takeuti, *Bounded arithmetic and truth definition*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **39** (1988), 75–104.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, MITSUI-SUMITOMO KAIJO
SENRI BLDG. 5F, 1-2-14 SENSENRI-NISHIMACHI, 560-0083 TOYONAKA, JAPAN
E-mail address: yoriyuki.yamagata@aist.go.jp